

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, the application included claims 48-67. Claims 48, 51, 53-56, 58-60, 62, 63 and 65 have been amended, claims 49, 50, 57 and 64 have been canceled, and claim 68 has been added. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 48, 51-56, 58-63 and 65-68 stand pending for examination.

Claims 48-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0265350 to Klein ("Klein"). Note, the Office Action appears to have mistakenly referred to "Israni et al." in the detailed discussion of the claim rejections. The Applicants have assumed the Office Action intended to refer to Klein and have responded accordingly.

Claims 48, 51, 53-56, 58-60, 62, 63 and 65 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the Applicants' invention, the support for which may be found at, for example, Figs. 2-4 and the associated detailed description. No new matter has been added.

Claim 57 has been rewritten into independent form as new claim 68.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Applicants note that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 5, 2005, has not been initialed by the Examiner. The Applicants request that the Examiner review the Information Disclosure Statement and return an initialed SB/08 to the undersigned attorney. A copy of the Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed for the Examiner's convenience.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 57 (now rewritten into independent form as claim 68) because the cited reference does not teach each and every claim element, either expressly or inherently, as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102(e). Specifically, Klein does not teach or suggest “removing records from the result set if an address value of the record differs from an address value of the starting record.” The Office Action cites ¶¶[0006], [0060] and [0068] for this teaching. Nowhere at these locations nor anywhere else does Klein teach the claimed element.

At the locations cited by the Office Action for this teaching, specifically ¶[0068], Klein discusses actions to be taken to retrieve a parcel-map from a database if a street name is not present in the database. In such cases, a zip code is used to retrieve all parcels in the zip code, but Klein does not teach “removing records from a result set if an address value of the record differs from an address value of the starting record” as claim 68 recites. Klein merely teaches an over-inclusive search without teaching the Applicants’ claimed approach for minimizing the over-inclusiveness. Hence, claim 68 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

Claims 48 and 59 include a similar element and are believed to be allowable for similar reasons. Moreover, claim 48 has been amended to recite performing both a location search and a name search for parcels and adding the results to a results set. Klein does not teach or suggest performing such multiple searches. Further, claim 48 now recites performing a third search using a third attribute value. Klein does not teach this either. Hence, claim 48 is believed to be allowable for this additional reason. Claim 59 includes similar elements and is believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reasons.

The remaining claims depend from either claim 48 or 59 and are believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above. Moreover, one or more independent claims include subject matter that further distinguishes these claims over the cited reference. For example, claims 55 and 63 recite determining whether a name attribute value does not at least approximately match a name contained in an excluded name list. Klein does not teach this at the cited locations nor anywhere else. Hence, these claims are believed to be allowable for this additional reason.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2007

/Irvin E. Branch/
Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
61023324 v1